

SUSY Breaking and Light Gauginos [SUSY95]

Glennys R. Farrar¹

*Department of Physics and Astronomy
Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08855, USA*

Abstract

Several supersymmetry breaking mechanisms do not produce dimension-3 operators. I show here that this scenario is consistent with present observations and has several significant virtues: i) When there are no dimension-3 SUSY-breaking operators there is no SUSY-CP problem. ii) SUSY-breaking need not occur through gauge singlets, so that the cosmological problems often encountered in hidden sector SUSY-breaking can be avoided. iii) Photino and gluino and R -hadron masses are naturally consistent with relic photinos providing the required dark matter density.

Requiring spontaneous electroweak symmetry implies that scalar masses are mostly in the ~ 100 GeV range. The gluino and photino are massless at tree level. At 1-loop, the gluino and photino masses at the ew scale are predicted to be $m_{\tilde{g}} \sim 10 - 600$ MeV and $m_{\tilde{\gamma}} \sim 100 - 1400$ MeV. New hadrons with mass $\sim 1\frac{1}{2}$ GeV are predicted and described. The “extra” flavor singlet pseudoscalar in the $\iota(1440)$ region which has been observed in several experiments is naturally interpreted as the mainly- $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ bound state which gets its mass via the QCD anomaly. Its superpartner, a gluon-gluino bound state, would be the lightest R -hadron. For the most interesting portions of parameter space the R^0 lifetime is $10^{-6} - 10^{-10}$ sec, so existing searches would not have been sensitive to it. Search strategies and other consequences of the scenario are briefly mentioned.

¹Invited talk at Colloque SUSY 95, Paris, May 1995. Research supported in part by NSF-PHY-91-21039

The customary approach to studying the phenomenological implications of supersymmetry has been to assume that the “low energy” effective Lagrangian below the SUSY-breaking scale, M_{SUSY} , contains all possible renormalizable operators, including in principle all possible soft supersymmetry breaking terms, consistent with the gauge symmetries and possibly some global and discrete symmetries. Some models of SUSY-breaking naturally lead to relations among the SUSY-breaking parameters at the scale M_{SUSY} so that the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) requires specification of 6-8 parameters beyond the gauge and Yukawa couplings already determined in the MSM: $\tan\beta \equiv \frac{v_U}{v_D}$, the ratio of the two Higgs vevs, μ , the coefficient of the SUSY-invariant coupling between higgsinos, M_0 , a universal SUSY-breaking scalar mass, m_{12}^2 , the SUSY-breaking mixing in the mass-squared matrix of the Higgs scalars (aka μB or $\mu M_0 B$ in alternate notations), $M_{1,2,3}$, the SUSY-breaking gaugino masses (proportional to one another if the MSSM is embedded in a GUT), and A , the coefficient of SUSY-breaking terms obtained by replacing the fermions in the MSM Yukawa terms by their superpartners. To obtain predictions for the actual superparticle spectrum in terms of these basic parameters, the renormalization group equations for masses, mixings and couplings are evolved from the scale M_{SUSY} to the scale M_{Z^0} where, on account of different RG running and flavor dependent couplings, the various scalars and fermions have quite different masses. A particularly attractive aspect of this approach is that for the heavy top quark which is found in nature, the mass-squared of a combination of Higgs fields becomes negative at low energy and the electroweak symmetry is spontaneously broken[1, 2], with m_Z a function of A , M_0 and other parameters of the theory. In this conventional treatment of the MSSM, squark and gluino masses are constrained by experiment to be greater than ~ 100 GeV[3].

I will argue here that a more restrictive form of SUSY breaking, one without dimension-3 operators, is actually superior in several respects. We shall see that the remaining parameters of the theory are well-constrained when electroweak symmetry breaking is demanded, and that the resultant model is both extremely predictive and consistent with laboratory and cosmological observations. If this is the correct structure of the low energy world, there will be many consequences which can be discovered and investigated before the construction of the LHC. Some of these are discussed below.

There are at least two good reasons for dispensing with dimension-3 SUSY breaking operators in the low energy theory. First, in order to produce dimension-3 operators in the appealing hidden-sector-dynamical-SUSY-breaking scenarios, the auxilliary component of one or more hidden sector *gauge singlet* field must develop a large vev. However as was emphasized in ref. [4], this implies particles with masses in the 100 GeV - 1 TeV region which are in conflict with cosmology, in particular causing late-time entropy production which is incompatible with primordial nucleosynthesis.

Besides avoiding the problems associated with singlet fields, not having dimension-3 SUSY breaking is attractive because it solves the SUSY CP problem. This can be seen in the MSSM as follows. In the absence of dimension-3 SUSY-breaking operators, the only phases beyond those

of the MSM (the phases in the quark mass matrix and the θ parameter) which can be present in the tree level theory appear in the parameters μ and m_{12}^2 . However a combination of an R -transformation and U(1) transformations on the Higgs superfields allows these phases to be removed. Any phase which is introduced thereby into the Yukawa terms in the superpotential can be removed by chiral transformations on the quark superfields, merely changing the phases which contribute to the strong CP problem (which must be solved by some other mechanism). Since the gauge-kinetic terms are not affected by U(1) and R transformations, the preceding manipulations do not introduce phases in interactions involving gauginos².

When there are no dimension-3 SUSY-breaking operators, A and $M_{1,2,3}$ are zero. The gluino and lightest neutralino are massless in tree approximation but they get masses at one loop from virtual quark-squark pairs. The neutralinos also get a contribution from “electroweak” loops involving wino/higgsino-Higgs/vector boson pairs[6, 7, 8]. The sizes of these corrections were estimated, for various values of M_0 , μ , and $\tan\beta$, in ref. [8]. There, it was determined that in order to insure that the chargino mass is greater than its LEP lower bound of about 45 GeV, μ must either be less than 100 GeV (and $\tan\beta \lesssim 2$) or greater than several TeV. Here I will also demand that the electroweak symmetry breaking produces the observed m_Z for $m_t \sim 175$ GeV. This is not possible in the large μ region, so I will consider only $\mu \lesssim 100$ GeV. In addition, from Fig. 6 of ref. [2] one sees that M_0 , the SUSY-breaking scalar mass, must be $\sim 100 - 300$ GeV, with 150 GeV being the favored value³. From Figs. 4 and 5 of ref. [8] this gives $m_{\tilde{g}} \sim 100 - 600$ and $m_{\tilde{\gamma}} \sim 100 - 900$ MeV at the ew scale. Since the electroweak loop was treated in ref. [8] with an approximation which is valid when M_0 or μ is $\gg m_Z$, those results for the photino mass are only indicative of the range to be expected. Until a more precise calculation is available, we attach a $\sim$ factor-of-two uncertainty to the electroweak loop, and consider the enlarged photino mass range 100 – 1400 MeV.

The most essential aspects of the phenomenology of this theory are:

1. Predicted mass and lifetime of the lightest R -meson, the $g\tilde{g}$ bound state denoted R^0 .
2. Predicted mass of the flavor singlet pseudoscalar which gets its mass via the anomaly (the “extra” pseudoscalar corresponding to the $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ ground state degree of freedom).
3. Identity of the flavor singlet pseudogoldstone boson resulting from the spontaneous breaking of the extra chiral symmetry associated with the light gluino.
4. Properties of the flavor-singlet R -baryon composed of $uds\tilde{g}$, called S^0 .
5. Production rates and detection strategies for the new R -hadrons.

²See ref. [5] for the more general case when the squark mass-squared is off-diagonal and a discussion of other related mechanisms.

³As shown by Lopez[9] et al and Diaz[10], the requirement of GUT unification and a *single, universal* SUSY-breaking scalar mass at the SUSY-breaking scale is at best marginally compatible with the chargino, neutralino and Higgs mass bounds. The deviation from universality need not be great to avoid this problem, however.

In order to estimate the R^0 lifetime, we need its mass. Fortunately, it can be quite well determined from existing lattice QCD calculations, as follows[11]. If the gluino were massless and there were no quarks in the theory (let us call this theory sYM), SUSY would be unbroken and the R^0 would be in a degenerate supermultiplet with the 0^{++} glueball, G , and a 0^{-+} state denoted $\tilde{\eta}$, which can be thought of as a $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ bound state. To the extent that quenched approximation is accurate for sYM⁴, the mass of the physical R^0 in the continuum limit of this theory would be the same as the mass of the 0^{++} glueball. The latest quenched lattice QCD value of $m(G)$ from the GF11 group is 1740 ± 71 MeV[12]⁵. The UKQCD collaboration reports[15] 1550 ± 50 MeV for the 0^{++} mass, but this error is only statistical. Adding in quadrature a 70 MeV lattice error and a 15% quenching uncertainty⁶ leads to a total uncertainty of ~ 270 MeV, so I will use the range 1.3 - 2 GeV for massless gluinos. Experimentally, the $f_0(1520)$ and $f_0(1720)$ seem to be the leading candidates for the ground state glueball, but the situation is still unclear[16]. Mixing with other flavor singlet pseudoscalars can shift the $\tilde{\eta}$ somewhat. For gluino masses small compared to the “confinement mass” of $\sim 1\frac{1}{2}$ GeV, one would expect the R^0 and $\tilde{\eta}$ masses to be insensitive to the gluino mass. Thus in the absence of a dedicated lattice gauge theory calculation of the masses of these particles, we can adopt the estimate, 1.3 – 2 GeV for all these states, G , $\tilde{\eta}$, and R^0 .

This discussion shows that in sYM, which is identical to ordinary QCD in quenched approximation, the $\tilde{\eta}$ with mass $\sim 1\frac{1}{2}$ GeV is the pseudoscalar which gets its mass from the anomaly. Thus in QCD with light gluinos the particle which gets its mass from the anomaly is predicted to be too heavy to be the η' . Instead, the η' should be identified with the pseudo-goldstone boson associated with the spontaneous breaking by quark and gluino condensates of the non-anomalous linear combination of the light quarks' chiral $U(1)$ and the gluinos' chiral $U(1)_R$ symmetries[11]. Using standard PCAC and current algebra techniques, I obtained in ref. [11] the relationship between masses and condensates necessary to produce the correct η' mass (ignoring mixing): $m_{\tilde{g}}$ (at the hadronic scale) times $\langle \bar{\lambda}\lambda \rangle \sim 10 m_s \langle \bar{s}s \rangle$. The required gluino condensate is reasonable, for $m_{\tilde{g}} \gtrsim 100$ MeV.⁷ In a more refined discussion, the physical η' would be treated as a superposition of the pseudo-goldstone boson and the orthogonal state which gets its mass from the anomaly. Surprising as it may seem, given present experimental and theoretical uncertainties, the η' could be this pseudogoldstone boson, containing $\sim 30\%$ $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ component. This is because accurately-tested, model-independent predictions concerning the η' are for ratios in which the gluino component plays no role.

⁴The 1-loop beta function is the same for sYM as for ordinary QCD with 3 light quarks, so the accuracy estimate for quenched approximation in ordinary QCD, 10 – 15%, may be applicable here.

⁵Note the increase from the 1440 ± 110 value given in ref. [13] and used in my SUSY95 talk and earlier work[11, 14].

⁶The uncertainty associated with quenched approximation with both light quarks and gluinos was taken in [11] to be 25%. However since the estimate of the quenching error for ordinary QCD is obtained by comparing lattice results with the hadron spectrum, it already includes the effects of gluinos, if they are present in nature.

⁷The top-stop loop produces $m_{\tilde{g}} \gtrsim 100$ MeV at the ew scale as long as $\mu \cot\beta$ is not too small and $M_0 \lesssim 300$ GeV[8]. Since the mass at the hadronic scale is larger than that at the ew scale, it is not difficult to accomodate this inequality.

Note parenthetically that this scenario *predicts* the existence of a flavor singlet pseudoscalar meson *in addition* to the η' , which is not a part of the conventional QCD spectrum of quark mesons and glueballs, whose mass should be $\sim 1.3 - 2$ GeV. Such a state has been found at $\sim 1410 - 1440$ MeV in radiative J/Ψ decay[17, 18] and, since SUSY95, in $p\bar{p}$ annihilation[19]. This state is extremely difficult to accommodate in conventional QCD since:

1. The first excited pseudoscalar nonet is filled by $\pi 1300$, $K 1460$, $\eta 1295$ and $\eta 1440$. The non-singlet members of the second excited pseudoscalar nonet are also clear: the $\pi 1770$ and $K 1830$. A flavor singlet member of this nonet cannot plausibly be as light as ~ 1420 MeV, and moreover suitable candidates for the two isosinglet members of the nonet are available.
2. Experimental evidence (and also lattice QCD) points to the scalar glueball being in the 1500-1700 MeV region. Since the pseudoscalar glueball is an $L = 1$ state, a naive analysis would place it higher in mass than the scalar glueball which has $L = 0$. This simple intuition is confirmed by lattice QCD calculations[15] which indicate the 0^{-+} glueball should be $\sim \frac{1}{2}$ GeV heavier than the 0^{++} glueball. Thus 1420 MeV appears to be an unreasonable mass for a pseudoscalar glueball.
3. The only remaining possibility advanced within conventional QCD for a state which is neither glueball nor a member of a nonet, is that it is a weakly bound “molecule” which therefore appears near threshold for production of the components of the molecule. Since the $K - K^*$ threshold is at 1390 MeV, this might be an explanation. But since the extra state under discussion is a pseudoscalar, the molecule would have to have $L = 1$. Due to the angular momentum barrier, binding in this channel seems extremely unlikely. Moreover if the $L = 1$ channel binds, one would expect much stronger binding in the $L = 0$ channel and such states have not been observed.
4. Other aspects of the state such as its width and production rate in radiative J/Ψ decay are consistent with its being primarily composed of gluons or gluinos and not compatible with its containing quarks[20].

For many years the famous UA1 figure[21] and its descendants, showing the allowed regions of the gluino-squark mass plane, has widely been accepted as excluding all but certain small “windows” for low gluino mass. However there are two significant problems with that analysis which makes it not valid for the very light gluino region. First off all, no distinction was made between the mass of the gluino and the mass of the lightest hadron containing it. Although this distinction is unimportant for heavy gluinos, it is essential when the gluino is light. Since the R^0 mass is $\sim 1\frac{1}{2}$ GeV in the massless gluino limit, this distinction is even more important for hadrons containing gluinos than it is for hadrons composed of quarks. Perturbative QCD predictions miss the kinematic suppression associated with non-perturbative mass-generation of the actual R -hadrons being produced. This results in some cases in a serious overestimate

of the expected production rate, and thus an exaggerated view of the experimental sensitivity. Papers relying on perturbative QCD typically report an excluded range of gluino mass, but for a very light gluino it would actually be closer to the truth to replace their “gluino mass” with half the mass of the R^0 .

The second and more serious problem with the UA1 compilation is that it *assumed* that the lightest R -hadron’s lifetime is short enough for missing energy and beam dump experiments to be sensitive to the neutralino produced by the R -hadron decay. However R -hadrons produced in the target or beam dump degrade in energy very rapidly due to their strong interactions. Thus only when the photino is emitted before the R -hadron interacts, will it have enough energy to pass the missing energy cut or be recognized in the downstream detector. As discussed in connection with a particular experiment in ref. [22], and more generally in ref. [11], if the R^0 lifetime is longer than $\sim 5 \cdot 10^{-11}$ sec this criterion is not met and beam dump and missing energy experiments become increasingly “blind” to light gluinos as their lifetime increases.

Therefore we must estimate the R^0 lifetime. Making a first-principles estimate of the lifetime of a light hadron is always problematic. Although the relevant short distance operators can be accurately fixed in terms of the parameters of the Lagrangian, hadronic matrix elements are difficult to determine. It is particularly tricky for the R^0 in this scenario because the photino mass is larger than the current gluino mass and, since $m_{\tilde{\gamma}} \sim \frac{1}{2}m_{R^0}$, the decay is highly suppressed even using a constituent mass for the gluino. The decay rate of a free gluino into a photino and massless $u\bar{u}$ and $d\bar{d}$ pairs is well known. The problem is to take into account how interactions with the gluon and “sea” inside the R^0 “loans” mass to the gluino. If this effect is ignored one would find the R^0 to be absolutely stable except in the upper portion of its estimated mass range.

A method of estimating the *maximal* effect of such a “loan”, and thus a lower limit on the R^0 lifetime, was obtained in ref. [14] by elaborating a suggestion of refs. [23, 24]. The basic idea is to think of the hadron as a bare massless parton (in this case a gluon) carrying momentum fraction x and a remainder (here, the gluino) having an effective mass $M\sqrt{1-x}$, where M is the mass of the decaying hadron, here the R^0 . Then the structure function, giving the probability distribution of partons of fraction x , also gives the distribution of effective masses for the remainder (here, the gluino). The distribution function of the gluon in the R^0 is unknown, but can be bracketed with extreme cases: the non-relativistic $F_{nr}(x) = \delta(x - \frac{1}{2})$ and the ultrarelativistic $F_{ur}(x) = 6x(1-x)$. The normalizations are chosen so that half the R^0 ’s momentum is carried by gluons. In the cosmologically interesting region (see below) $1.6 \leq r \leq 2$, the lifetime given by this model is between 10^{-6} and 10^{-9} sec for $m(R^0) = 1.5$ GeV and a 150 GeV squark.

The decay rates produced in this model can be considered upper limits on the actual decay rate, because the model maximizes the “loan” in dynamical mass which can be made by the gluons to the gluino. For kaon semileptonic decay (where the $K_{\mu 3}$ mode would be strongly suppressed or excluded in the absence of similar effects, since the strange quark current mass

is of the same order as the muon mass) this model gives the correct ratio between $K_{\mu 3}$ and $K_{e 3}$ rates, and rates 2-4 times larger than observed: overestimating the rate as we anticipated, but not by a terribly large factor. Although a large range of uncertainty should be attached to the R^0 lifetime estimated this way, these results are still useful because they give lower bounds on the lifetime. Even with the ultrarelativistic wavefunction which gives the shortest lifetime estimate, for most of the parameter space of interest the lifetime is long enough that energy degradation in a beam dump experiment is significant. See ref. [5] for a detailed discussion and revised constraints.

I explained above why the usual beam dump and missing energy limits are not applicable to the very-light, long-lived gluinos predicted in this scenario. In refs. [11, 5] I also investigated other experiments which are potentially relevant and found that the interesting regions of mass ($m(R^0) \lesssim 2$ GeV) and lifetime ($\tau(R^0) \gtrsim 10^{-10}s$), are essentially unconstrained experimentally! However photinos of mass $\lesssim 1$ GeV are an integral prediction of this scenario and such light photinos are commonly believed to be excluded. As was the case for the light gluinos, closer examination reveals that this is not actually correct when the details of the scenario are taken into account. First of all, since gaugino masses come from radiative corrections, limits relying on GUT tree-level relations between gaugino masses do not apply. Furthermore, the lightest and next-to-lightest neutralinos (called in general χ_1^0 and χ_2^0) are not produced in Z decays with sufficient rate to be observed at LEP, because in this scenario the χ_1^0 is extremely close to being pure photino[8]. It contains so little higgsino that $Z^0 \rightarrow \chi_1^0 \chi_1^0$ and $Z^0 \rightarrow \chi_1^0 \chi_2^0$ are suppressed compared to the conventional scenario with tree-level gaugino masses. Except for very small μ , the mass of the χ_2^0 is high enough that its pair production is too small to be important for most of parameter space, since $\tan\beta$ is already required to be fairly small from the chargino mass limit.

It has also been claimed that a stable photino with mass less than ~ 15 GeV is excluded because it would produce too large a relic abundance, “overclosing” the universe. These calculations assumed that self annihilation was the only important mechanism for keeping photinos in thermal equilibrium, leading to freeze out at a temperature $T \sim \frac{1}{14}m_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, below which the self-annihilation rate is less than the expansion rate of the universe. However it has recently been shown[25] that when the gluino is also light, other processes involving $\tilde{\gamma} - R^0$ interconversion followed by R^0 self-annihilation become important, and freezeout is delayed to a lower temperature. When the ratio $r = \frac{m(R^0)}{m_{\tilde{\gamma}}}$ is in the range 1.6 - 2, the relic photino abundance can account for the dark matter of the universe[25]. Only when $r \gtrsim 2.2$ would the photino relic density be unacceptably large. If that were the case, this scenario would only be viable if R -parity were violated, so that the photino was not absolutely stable. Note that the desirable range $1.6 < r < 2.2$ is consistent with the R^0 and photino masses expected in this scenario (even predicted in advance of the dark matter density calculation of ref. [25]).

There is another interesting light R -hadron besides the R^0 , namely the flavor singlet scalar baryon $uds\tilde{g}$ denoted S^0 . In view of the very strong hyperfine attraction among the quarks[26],

this state may be similar in mass to the R^0 .⁸ If its mass is $\sim 1\frac{1}{2}$ GeV, it will be extremely long lived, or even stable if $m(S^0) - m(p) - m(e^-) < m_{\tilde{\gamma}}$. Even if decay to a photino and nucleon is kinematically allowed, the decay rate will be very small since it requires a flavor-changing-neutral transition as well as an electromagnetic interaction. If the S^0 does not bind to nuclei, its being absolutely stable is not experimentally excluded[26, 11]. In fact the S^0 seems unlikely to bind to nuclei since the two-pion-exchange force, which is attractive between nucleons but insufficient to explain their binding, is repulsive in this case[11] because the mass of the intermediate R_Λ or R_Σ is much larger than that of the S^0 .⁹ For further discussion of the S^0 and other R -hadrons see refs. [26] and [11].

In ref. [11] I discussed strategies for detecting or excluding the existence of an R^0 with a lifetime too long to be detected via decays in an accelerator experiment. If instead the R^0 lifetime is in the range $\sim \text{few}10^{-6} - \text{few} \times 10^{-10}\text{s}$, it will be possible with planned rare kaon decay and ϵ'/ϵ experiments to find evidence for the R^0 [28]. If R^0 's exist in the $\lesssim 2$ GeV mass range, the beam for a kaon experiment will contain R^0 's, whose decays one wants to observe. Given the expected R^0 mass and assuming the photino mass corresponds to the cosmologically interesting region of r , the signal for an R^0 decay in the detector is distinctive: a single π^0 or η (or $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair with invariant mass greater than m_K), with substantial $p_\perp$. See refs. [14, 28] for more detailed rate estimates and further discussion.

In summary, I have shown that when SUSY breaking only arises through dimension-2 operators, there is no SUSY CP problem. Gauge singlet fields breaking SUSY are unnecessary, so that the attendant cosmological problems are avoided. Parameters of the theory can be constrained by requiring correct electroweak symmetry breaking. The lightest SUSY particles are the photino and glueballino with masses predicted to be in the ranges 100 – 1400 MeV and 1.3 – 2 GeV respectively. For squarks masses in the normally expected range, the lifetime and properties of the new hadrons are not in conflict with existing experimental limits. Possibilities for their detection were mentioned. The photino is an attractive cold dark matter candidate because, when the ratio $m(R^0)/m_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ lies in the range $\sim 1.6 - 2$, its relic abundance leads to $\Omega h^2 \sim 0.25 - 1$ consistent with observation. The lightest chargino must be lighter than the W .

Acknowledgements: I am indebted to W. Willis and M. Schwartz for discussions of search strategies, and to collaborators in investigating various aspects of this problem: E. W. Kolb, C. Kolda, M. Luty, A. Masiero and S. Thomas.

⁸It is amusing that the (spin 1/2) baryon spectrum contains an anomalous state, the $\Lambda(1405)$, which this discussion suggests is likely to be a uds -gluon flavor singlet cryptoexotic baryon. The validity of this suggestion for identity of the $\Lambda(1405)$ is of course independent of the existence of light gluinos.

⁹If its decay to a nucleon is kinematically forbidden, the S^0 would be absolutely stable unless both R -parity and baryon-number conservation are violated. In several models of R -parity violation, e.g. [27], R -parity is violated in association with lepton number violation, but baryon number is conserved. In this case the photino would be unstable (e.g., $\tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow \nu\gamma$) but the S^0 stable. Stable relic S^0 's could make up part of the missing mass in our galaxy, but since they have strong interactions they might clump too much to account for the bulk of the missing dark matter of the universe.

References

- [1] L. Ibanez and G. Ross. *Phys. Lett.*, B110:215, 1982.
- [2] L. Alvarez-Gaume, J. Polchinski, and M. Wise. *Nucl. Phys.*, B221:495, 1983.
- [3] F. Abe et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 69:3439, 1992.
- [4] T. Banks, D. Kaplan, and A. Nelson. *Phys. Rev.*, D49:779, 1994.
- [5] G. R. Farrar. Technical Report RU-95-25 and hep-ph/9508291, Rutgers Univ., 1995.
- [6] R. Barbieri, L. Girardello, and A. Masiero. *Phys. Lett.*, B127:429, 1983.
- [7] D. Pierce and A. Papadopoulos. Technical Report JHU-TIPAC-940001, PURD-TH-94-04, hep-ph/9403240, Johns Hopkins and Purdue, 1994.
- [8] G. R. Farrar and A. Masiero. Technical Report RU-94-38, hep-ph/9410401, Rutgers Univ., 1994.
- [9] J. Lopez and D. Nanopoulos nad X. Wang. *Phys. Lett.*, B313:241, 1993.
- [10] M. Diaz. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 73:2409, 1994.
- [11] G. R. Farrar. *Phys. Rev.*, D51:3904, 1994.
- [12] H. Chen, J. Sexton, A. Vaccarino, and D. Weingarten. *Nucl. Phys.*, B(Proc. Supp.)34:357, 1994.
- [13] H. Chen, J. Sexton, A. Vaccarino, and D. Weingarten. Technical Report IBM-HET-94-1, IBM Watson Labs, 1994.
- [14] G. R. Farrar. Technical Report RU-95-17 and hep-ph/9504295, Rutgers Univ., April, 1995.
- [15] G. Bali et al. *Phys. Lett.*, B309:378, 1993.
- [16] C. Amsler and F. Close. Technical Report RAL-95-036; hep-ph/9505219, Rutherford Lab, 1995. Evidence for a Scalar Glueball.
- [17] J. E. Augustin et al. Technical Report 90-53, LAL, 1990.
- [18] Z. Bai et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 65:2507, 1990.
- [19] The Crystal Barrel Collaboration. Technical Report to be published in *Phys. Lett. B*, CERN, 1995.
- [20] M. Cakir and G. R. Farrar. *Phys. Rev.*, D50:3268, 1994.
- [21] UA1 Collaboration. *Phys. Lett.*, 198B:261, 1987.

- [22] G. R. Farrar. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 55:895, 1985.
- [23] G. Altarelli, N. Cabibbo, G. Corbo, L. Maiani, and G. Martinelli. *Nucl. Phys.*, B208:365, 1982.
- [24] E. Franco. *Phys. Lett.*, 124B:271, 1983.
- [25] G. R. Farrar and E. W. Kolb. Technical Report RU-95-18 and astro-ph/9504081, Rutgers Univ., 1995.
- [26] G. R. Farrar. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 53:1029–1033, 1984.
- [27] A. Masiero and J. Valle. *Phys. Lett.*, B251:273, 1990.
- [28] G. R. Farrar. Technical Report RU-95-26 and hep-ph/9508292, Rutgers Univ., 1995.